

REMARKS

1. Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 3-19, 21-31, and 34 stand rejected under § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Bowman-Amuah, U.S. Pat. No. 6,697,824 (hereinafter "Bowman").

2. Response to § 102 Rejections

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons set out below, and ask the Examiner for reconsideration.

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

a. BOWMAN DOES NOT TEACH EVERY ELEMENT OF CLAIM 1

Claim 1 includes the following limitations:

A method of harvesting feedback pertaining to transactions facilitated by a network-based transaction facility, the method including:

identifying a plurality of transactions associated with a first user, the plurality of transactions comprising completed transactions, facilitated by the network-based transaction facility, in which the first user participated with at least one other user;

communicating user interface information from the network-based transaction facility to a client associated with the first user via a communications network, the user interface information including transaction information concerning at least first and second transactions of

the plurality of transactions associated with the first user and specifying a single feedback interface facilitating user input of feedback information for each of the at least first and second transactions of the plurality of transactions; and

receiving, at the network-based transaction facility, the feedback information provided by the first user through the single feedback interface, for each of at least the first and second transactions, the feedback information being received via the communications network.

(emphasis added)

Bowman generally discloses a method for a user to interact with a system over a network to personalize a website by collecting information about the user to build a profile of attributes about the user. Bowman then matches those attributes with content that may be of interest to the user. The user may then select which of the content is to be displayed and how it is to be displayed on the user interface. In support, Bowman describes making purchases over a network using a process that includes displaying information about a product for sale, receiving payment, and fulfilling the order, as shown in Fig. 27 and cited by the Examiner. However, this broad description of a type of network transaction, or any other description in Bowman, does not disclose identifying a plurality of transactions associated with a first user, the plurality of transactions comprising completed transactions, facilitated by a network-based transaction facility, in which the first user participated with at least one other user, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Bowman does not disclose these features of claim 1 as recited.

Furthermore, Bowman does not disclose communicating user interface information from the network-based transaction facility to a client associated with the first user via a communications network, the user interface information including transaction information concerning at least first and second transactions of the plurality of

transactions associated with the first user and specifying a single feedback interface facilitating user input of feedback information for each of the at least first and second transactions of the plurality of transactions. Nowhere in Bowman does it discuss the user interface information including transaction information concerning at least first and second transactions of the plurality of transactions, as recited in claim 1. Bowman describes registration forms, questionnaires, rating interface, filter or query interface, and a configuration interface (Col. 45, Ln. 59-67 to Col. 46, Ln. 1-19). Even the closest match, the ratings interface, only briefly describes an interface to allow a user to rate content or products. It does not discuss the user interface information including transaction information concerning at least first and second transactions of the plurality of transactions. Consequently, Bowman does not disclose this element of claim 1 as recited.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner has cited a multitude of elements from the figures of Bowman. However, these elements and their corresponding descriptions, merely discuss the storing of item details (e.g., price, etc.) and some transaction data. For example, Figure 27, 2708, “allowing save and recall of the product and price of the order,” and the very general statement of box 2902, Figure 29, “providing an ability to search for information on the network via a site.” These elements alone or in aggregate do not recite the user interface information (communicated) including transaction information concerning at least first and second transactions of the plurality of transactions associated with the first user, or specifying a single feedback interface facilitating user input of feedback information for each of the at least first and second transactions of the plurality of transactions.

Lastly, Bowman does not disclose receiving, at the network-based transaction facility, the feedback information provided by the first user through the single feedback interface, for each of at least the first and second transactions, where the feedback information is received via the communications network. At best, Bowman discusses allowing a user to provide feedback or recommendations regarding content or products on

a site to promote customer relations with a particular site (Col. 54, Ln 1-8 and Col. 56, Ln. 4-30). However, this discussion does not include providing, through a single feedback interface, feedback information for each of at least the first and second transactions, as recited in claim 1.

Because Bowman does not teach each and every element as set forth in claim 1, it does not anticipate claim 1 as presently recited. Because independent claims 18, 30, 31, and 34 have limitations substantially similar to claim 1, the same arguments that apply to claim 1 also apply to these claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above, independent claims 1, 18, 30, 31, and 34 are patentable over the cited art.

As a dependent claim is deemed to include the limitations of a claim from which it depends, the arguments presented above also address the rejections against the dependent claims associated with each of the independent claims 1 and 18. Accordingly, the rejections against the dependent claims have been addressed, and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

3. Conclusion

Having tendered the above remarks and amended the claims as indicated herein, Applicants respectfully submit that all rejections have been addressed and that the claims are now in a condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicants hereby request such an extension.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Dated: 10-13, 2004 Nathan P. Elder
Nathan P. Elder
Reg. No. 55,150

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 947-8200